



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,783	12/29/2004	Hiroshi Yahata	OKUDP0103US	3064
43076 7590 10/28/2008 MARK D. SARALINO (GENERAL) RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE, NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115-2191				
EXAMINER HARVEY, DAVID E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,783

Applicant(s)

YAHATA ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID E. HARVEY

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A) With respect to claim 1:

1) The examiner notes that the "to be presented by switching..." recitation set forth in lines 3-4 of claim 1 is indefinite because it defines how the video signal might be, or is intended to be, displayed rather than defining the format/content of the video itself.

The examiner notes that a "video" signal is, by definition, a signal that represents a sequence of still picture frames occurring at a predetermined picture rate such that, when the picture frames of the video signal are successively displayed on a display device, they are integrated by the eye of a viewer to provide the viewer with the impression of motion.

As note above, lines 3-5 of claim 1 recite a "first primary video" that is:

"to be presented by switching a plurality of pictures one after another at a first vertical scanning frequency".

To the extent that it is understood, this recitation is confusing and appears to be misdescriptive. Specifically, when read in light of the instant disclosure, the recitation simply appears to refer to nothing more than the fact that the recited "first video" comprises "a first picture rate"; i.e., the pictures of the first video never actually appear to be "switched" one after another as is currently suggested by the claim. Rather, when displayed by the display device, the pictures of the video are successively presented, one after another, in conventional video signal display fashion to impart the impression of motion when integrated by the eye of the viewer.

Appropriate clarification of the above is needed. Here, it is suggested that the recitation "to be presented by switching a plurality of pictures one after another at a first vertical scanning frequency" be changed to read --having a first picture rate--.

2) The examiner notes that similar clarification is needed for the recitation "to be presented by switching the pictures at a second vertical scanning frequency, which is different from the first vertical scanning frequency" set forth in lines 10-13 of claim 1. Here, it is suggested that the recitation be change to read, -- having a second picture rate that is different from the first picture rate."

B) With respect to claim 11:

- 1) Lines 3-5 of claim 11 require similar clarifications as exemplified above with respect to lines 3-5 of claim 1.
- 2) Lines 9-11 of claim 11 require similar clarifications as exemplified above with respect to lines 10-13 of claim 1.

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

A) In order to be eligible under Section 101, a "process"/method claim, i.e., a claim that recites a series of steps or actions, must:

- 1) Be "tied" to another statutory category, such as a particular apparatus,
or
- 2) "Transform" an article or material to a different state or thing.

For example, as recently underscored by the circuit court, with reference to past Supreme Court decisions:

"[t]he Supreme Court has recognized only two instances in which such a method may qualify as a section 101 process: when the process 'either [1] was tied to a particular apparatus or [2] operated to change materials to a 'different state or thing.'" See PTO Supp. Br. 4 (quoting *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 588n.9). In *Diehr*, the Supreme Court confirmed that a process reciting an algorithm could be statutory subject matter if it: (1) is tied to a machine or (2) creates or involves a composition of matter or manufacture."¹² 450 U.S. at 184." (emphasis added)

In re Comiskey, 84 USPQ2d 1670, 1678. (Fed. Cir. 2007)

Instant method claims 11-20 are directed to non-statutory subject matter because, as recited, the claims:

1. Are not tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus), and
2. Do not transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing.

6. The showing of the *prior art* of “Lin” and “Matsuda”:

A) U.S. Patent #7,042,511 to Lin:

Lin is cited as evidencing:

a) That those of ordinary skill in the art had recognized the need/desire to display the video information provided from DVD players on different display devices of different display formats; i.e., wherein the video information played from the DVD was known to have comprised a main picture component and a sub-picture component:

[Note: lines 56-64 of column 1; lines 11-22 of column 2; and lines 34-37 of column 2];

b) That, to provide such a multi-display device capability, it was known and conventional to have provided video information processing circuitry in the DVD players (e.g., @ Figure 1), wherein the video processing circuitry included:

1) First circuitry (@ 10 of Figure 1) for converting the video signal format of the reproduced main picture component into the video signal display format of the display device being used;

2) Second circuitry (@ 20 of Figure 1) for converting the video signal format of the reproduced sub-picture component into said same video signal display format of the display device being used; and

3) Third circuitry (@ 190 of Figure 1) for mixing the converted main and sub-picture components into a synthesized image signal for display on the display device in the desired format.

[Note: lines 34-67 of column 2; and I29-33 of column 4]

It is noted that in Lin format conversion is explicitly described in terms of image scaling, e.g., changes in aspect ratio and/or the size of the images, not picture frequency [note lines 24-28 of column 11]. Nonetheless, as was notoriously well known in the art, Lin explicitly states the need to convert both the main and sub-picture components into the common display format prior to mixing in order to avoid distortion and/or degradations in display quality [note lines 43-49 of column 2].

B) Japanese Patent Document #2000-92458 to Matsuda (machine generated translation provided):

Matsuda has been cited because, like Lin discussed above, it also describes playback circuitry for a DVD player which operates to convert the format of the produced video information into the display format of the display device attached thereto; i.e., wherein, as in the case of Lin discussed above, the video information comprised a main video signal component and a secondary subtitle image component.

As shown in figure 8, the DVD playback circuitry described in Matsuda comprised:

- 1) Circuitry (not shown in the Figure) for retrieving the video information from a DVD recording medium (@ 1) wherein the video information represents video/movie picture information recorded at a frame rate of 24 frames per second;
- 2) Processing circuitry (@ 3 and 33) for receiving the video information retrieved from the DVD (@ 1) and for:
 - a) Converting (@ 3) the main video signal component into a standard interlace video signal of 60 interlaced fields per second (i.e., "60i");
 - b) Converting (@ 33) the secondary subtitle image component into a standard interlace video signal of 60 interlaced fields per second (i.e., "60i");
- 3) First converting circuitry (@ 19) for converting the standard interlaced video signal representing the main video signal into a progressively scanned video signal of video signal of 60 frames per second ("60P") as required by the display device attached thereto (not shown in the figure);
- 4) Second converting circuitry (@ 35) for converting the standard interlaced video signal representing the secondary subtitle image signal into a progressively scanned secondary image signal of 60 frames per second ("60P") as required by the display device attached thereto (not shown in the figure); and
- 5) Mixing circuitry (@ 37) for mixing the converted main and sub-picture component signals into a synthesized image signal for display on the display device in the desired format.

[Note: paragraphs 0005-0008 and 0039-0054 of the machine generated translation]

7. Other "prior art"/references:

A) U.S. Patent #6,532,041 to Monta et al:

Monta et al. has been cited for its illustration of conventional teletext receiving and display circuitry (note figure 1).

B) U.S. Patent #5,438,370 to Primiano et al:

Primiano et al. has been cited for its illustration of a multi-standard receiver (note figure 7).

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #7,042,511 to Lin in view of Japanese Patent Document #2000-92458 to Matsuda.**

A) Given the section 112 issues set forth above in paragraph 3 of this Office action, claim 1 has been construed to mean:

A data processor comprising:

- 1) A receiving section that receives a data stream including
 - a) data representing first primary video *having a first picture rate*
 - and
 - b) data representing first auxiliary video to be presented synchronously with the first primary video; and
- 2) A converting section for converting the data representing the first primary video and the first auxiliary video into data representing synthetic video *having a second picture rate that is different from the first picture rate;*

wherein the data stream includes timing information defining respective times to present the first primary video and the first auxiliary video,

and

wherein the converting section associates second auxiliary video, having the same contents as the first auxiliary video on a picture of the first primary video, with a picture of second primary video, having the same contents as the counterpart of the first primary video, thereby generating synthetic video composed of the second primary video and the second auxiliary video.

B) The showing Lin (note part "A" in paragraph 6 of this Office action):

As is shown in Figure 1, Lin describes conventional playback circuitry that was used in a conventional DVD player, wherein the conventional DVD player (not shown in the figures) necessarily comprised:

- 1) A "**receiving section**" (not shown in the Figures) for receiving the data stream that is necessarily read from the DVD medium and for separating therefrom:
 - a) The "**first video**" data ("VD" of Figure 1) that is provided to the input of the video data scaling unit (@ 10 of Figure 1), wherein such video data represents, by definition, a plurality of picture frames occurring at a **first predetermined frame rate**; and
 - b) The "**auxiliary video**" data ("SB" of Figure 1) that is provided to the sub-picture scaling unit (@ 20 of Figure 1) wherein the sub-

picture data represents a sequence of video pictures, e.g., such as subtitles (e.g. note lines 64-67 of column 1 and lines 1-5 of column 2), which are to be presented synchronously with the pictures of the first video data; and

2) A "**converting section**" (i.e., @ Figure 1) for:

a) Converting (@ 10 of Figure 1) the data representing the first primary video data (@ "VD" of Figure 1) and the data representing the first auxiliary video (@ "SB" of Figure 1) into data (@ "VS" of Figure 1) representing a synthetic (i.e., "mixed") video having format converted pictures occurring at **a second predetermined frame rate**;

wherein the data stream read/provided by the DVD inherently comprises time stamp information defining respective time to present the first primary ("VD") and the first auxiliary ("SB") video [i.e., such time stamp information was dictated/required via the DVD recording specification]; and

wherein the input to the video inputs (@ VD and SB of Figure 1) represent the same content as the respective video components of the synthesized signal (@ "VS" of Figure 1); i.e., the content is the same however the format of the content has been changed (e.g., as described, the aspect ratio of the video content has been changed/scaled).

B) Differences:

Claim 1 differs from the showing of Lin in that claim 1 requires the second predetermined picture/frame rate to be different from the first predetermined picture/frame rate. Given that the format conversion that is described with respect to elements 10 and 20 in Figure 1 of Lin is described as pertaining to image scaling (e.g., aspect ratio conversion), the picture/frame rate is not necessarily changed; i.e., the second frame rate may be the same as the first.

C) Obviousness:

Matsuda evidences that it was known for the data stream on DVDs to have represented video signals having a frame rate of 24 pictures/frames per second and for the DVD player to have comprised conversion circuitry for converting the reproduced data into a video signal having a frame rate of 30 frames per second (i.e., 60 interlaced filed per second). The invention described in Matsuda pertains to the additional of additional conversion circuitry for converting the produced interlaced video signal (@ "60i") into a progressively scanned video signal having a frame rate of 60 frames per second (@ "60p"). When the reproduced video data includes auxiliary video (e.g., subtitles) Matsuda, like Lin

above, teaches the provision of respective format converters (e.g., @ 19 and 35 of Figure 8) for converting the format (i.e., frame rates) of the respective video signals prior to synthesis [i.e., mixing (@ 37)].

Given the showing of Matsuda, it is maintained that it would have been obvious to have modified the format converting circuits (@ 10 and 20) shown in Figure 1 of Lin to provide frame rate conversion too thereby advantageously permitting the player to be used with a wider range of display devices.

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #7,042,511 to Lin in view of Japanese Patent Document #2000-92458 to Matsuda for the same reasons that were set forth above for claim 1.

11. Claims 2-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #7,042,511 to Lin in view of Japanese Patent Document #2000-92458 to Matsuda for the same reasons that were set forth above for claim 1. Additionally:

A) With respect to claim 2:

As noted above, the sub-picture data in Lin represent subtitles which, by definition, comprise text data (i.e., respective sets of "letters"/characters).

B) With respect to claim 3:

The examiner takes Official Notice that, in accordance with the DVD specification, the sub-pictures are superposed onto the pictures of the main video in accordance with time stamps found in each stream. The examiner maintains that system/disclosure of Lin is clearly based on the DVD specification and, as such, obviously (if not inherently) utilized such time stamps to perform the required synchronization of the subtitles/sub-pictures to the main video.

C) With respect to claim 4:

The scaling described in Lin constitutes changes in picture resolution.

D) With respect to claim 5:

The frame rate conversion described Matsuda was performed for the purpose of converting the 24 FPS movie data recorded on the DVD discs into the conventional 30 frame per second rate of standard video signals displays (e.g., the NTSC standard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided conversion at frame rates for other international standards, e.g., such as PAL, thereby advantageously allowing the player to be used with a wider range of display devices.

E) With respect to claim 6:

The frame rate conversion described Matsuda was performed for the purpose of converting the 24 FPS movie data recorded on the DVD discs into the conventional 30 frame per second rate of standard video signals displays (e.g., the NTSC standard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided conversion at frame rates for other international standards, e.g., such as PAL, thereby advantageously allowing the player to be used with a wider range of display devices.

The examiner maintains that the conversion from the 24 FPS rate to the 30 FPS rate dictates a standard telecine frame to field conversion in which fields in alternative sets of frames are repeated [See Figure 11 of Matsuda]

F) With respect to claim 7:

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the DVD art for recorded programming to have included use/copy prevention codes/circuitry to selectively permit/authorize the playback of the content recorded thereon. In the modified system of Lin. Such a conventional feature would have had the effect of permitting (or not permitting) format conversion; e.g., such conversion is permitted when the playback device is authorized to play the content.

G) With respect to claim 8:

The format of the recorded data in the modified system of Lin implicitly dictates the conversion that must be performed. Alternatively, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the standards conversion art to have tagged the video signals to be converted with standard identifying information to simplify the converting circuit; i.e., to eliminate the need to detect things such as frame rate, line rate, field rate, and ratios thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tagged the recorded video signal in the modified system of Lin for like simplification of the conversion circuitry. In either case, the information must be "input" to the system.

H) With respect to claim 9:

The format of the recorded data in the modified system of Lin implicitly dictates the conversion that must be performed. Alternatively, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the standards conversion art to have tagged the video signals to be converted with standard identifying information to simplify the converting circuit; i.e., to eliminate the need to detect things such as frame rate, line rate, field rate, and ratios thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tagged the recorded video signal in the modified system of Lin for like simplification of the conversion circuitry. In either case, the information must be "input" to the system.

I) With respect to claim 10:

1) The format of the recorded data in the modified system of Lin implicitly dictates the conversion that must be performed. Alternatively, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the standards conversion art to have tagged the video signals to be converted with standard identifying information to simplify the converting circuit; i.e., to eliminate the need to detect things such as frame rate, line rate, field rate, and ratios thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tagged the recorded video signal in the modified system of Lin for like simplification of the conversion circuitry. In either case, the information must be "input" to the system; and

2) The frame rate conversion described Matsuda was performed for the purpose of converting the 24 FPS movie data recorded on the DVD discs into the conventional 30 frame per second rate of standard video signals displays (e.g., the NTSC standard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided conversion at frame rates for other international standards, e.g., such as PAL, thereby advantageously allowing the player to be used with a wider range of display devices.

The examiner maintains that the conversion from the 24 FPS rate to the 30 FPS rate dictates a standard telecine frame to field conversion in which fields in alternative sets of frames are repeated [See Figure 11 of Matsuda]

12. Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #7,042,511 to Lin in view of Japanese Patent Document #2000-92458 to Matsuda for the same reasons that were set forth above for claim 11. Additionally:

A) With respect to claim 12:

As noted above, the sub-picture data in Lin represent subtitles which, by definition, comprise text data (i.e., respective sets of "letters"/characters).

B) With respect to claim 13:

The examiner takes Official Notice that, in accordance with the DVD specification, the sub-pictures are superposed onto the pictures of the main video in accordance with time stamps found in each stream. The examiner maintains that system/disclosure of Lin is clearly based on the DVD specification and, as such, obviously (if not inherently) utilized such time stamps to perform the required synchronization of the subtitles/sub-pictures to the main video.

C) With respect to claim 14:

The scaling described in Lin constitutes changes in picture resolution.

D) With respect to claim 15:

The frame rate conversion described Matsuda was performed for the purpose of converting the 24 FPS movie data recorded on the DVD discs into the conventional 30 frame per second rate of standard video signals displays (e.g., the NTSC standard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided conversion at frame rates for other international standards, e.g., such as PAL, thereby advantageously allowing the player to be used with a wider range of display devices.

E) With respect to claim 16:

The frame rate conversion described Matsuda was performed for the purpose of converting the 24 FPS movie data recorded on the DVD discs into the conventional 30 frame per second rate of standard video signals displays (e.g., the NTSC standard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided conversion at frame rates for other international standards, e.g., such as PAL, thereby advantageously allowing the player to be used with a wider range of display devices.

The examiner maintains that the conversion from the 24 FPS rate to the 30 FPS rate dictates a standard telecine frame to field conversion in which fields in alternative sets of frames are repeated [See Figure 11 of Matsuda]

F) With respect to claim 17:

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the DVD art for recorded programming to have included use/copy prevention codes/circuitry to selectively permit/authorize the playback of the content recorded thereon. In the modified system of Lin. Such a conventional feature would have had the effect of permitting (or not permitting) format conversion; e.g., such conversion is permitted when the playback device is authorized to play the content.

G) With respect to claim 18:

The format of the recorded data in the modified system of Lin implicitly dictates the conversion that must be performed. Alternatively, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the standards conversion art to have tagged the video signals to be converted with standard identifying information to simplify the converting circuit; i.e., to eliminate the need to detect things such as frame rate, line rate, field rate, and ratios thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tagged the recorded video signal in the modified system of Lin for like simplification of the conversion circuitry. In either case, the information must be "input" to the system.

H) With respect to claim 19:

The format of the recorded data in the modified system of Lin implicitly dictates the conversion that must be performed. Alternatively, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the standards conversion art to have tagged the video signals to be converted with standard identifying information to simplify the converting circuit; i.e., to eliminate the need to detect things such as frame rate, line rate, field rate, and ratios thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tagged the recorded video signal in the modified system of Lin for like simplification of the conversion circuitry. In either case, the information must be "input" to the system.

I) With respect to claim 20:

1) The format of the recorded data in the modified system of Lin implicitly dictates the conversion that must be performed. Alternatively, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the standards conversion art to have tagged the video signals to be converted with standard identifying information to simplify the converting circuit; i.e., to eliminate the need to detect things such as frame rate, line rate, field rate, and ratios thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tagged the recorded video signal in the modified system of Lin for like simplification of the conversion circuitry. In either case, the information must be "input" to the system; and

2) The frame rate conversion described Matsuda was performed for the purpose of converting the 24 FPS movie data recorded on the DVD discs into the conventional 30 frame per second rate of standard video signals displays (e.g., the NTSC standard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided conversion at frame rates for other international standards, e.g., such as PAL, thereby advantageously allowing the player to be used with a wider range of display devices.

The examiner maintains that the conversion from the 24 FPS rate to the 30 FPS rate dictates a standard telecine frame to field conversion in which fields in alternative sets of frames are repeated [See Figure 11 of figure 11 of Matsuda]

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID E. HARVEY whose telephone number is (571) 272-7345. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:00AM to 3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Marsh D. Harold-Banks, can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DAVID E HARVEY/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621

DAVID E HARVEY
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621